E2rematc 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 06 CR 150(JSR) 4 V. 5 MICHAEL MATERASSO, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 February 27, 2014 9 11:09 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. JED S. RAKOFF, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York BY: DANIEL TEHRANI 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 BALLARD, SPAHR & STILLMAN Attorney for Defendant 19 BY: MARJORIE PEERCE ELAINE LOU 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (In open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will everyone please be seated.

3 And will the parties please identify themselves for the record.

MR. TEHRANI: Good morning, your Honor. Daniel
Tehrani for the government. With me at counsel table is senior
United States Probation Officer Margaret Carroll.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. PEERCE: Good morning, your Honor. Marjorie
Peerce and Elaine Lou, Ballard, Spahr & Stillman.

THE COURT: We're here for a sentence.

First, let me hear from defense counsel, then from government counsel and then from the defendant, if he wishes to be heard.

I will note for the record that I have received a memo from defense counsel, including several attachments, letters from his family and so forth, and also a submission from the government.

MS. PEERCE: Thank you, your Honor. That's all I understand is before the Court.

Your Honor, for all the reasons set forth in our sentencing submission, respectfully, we most respectfully request that you sentence Mr. Materasso to time served. I know that's a very -- I want to come up with the right word. It is far --

THE COURT: Hard argument to make.

MS. PEERCE: It is far below the guidelines, I understand that.

THE COURT: The guidelines, schmuidelines. I don't know how the transcript will look on that sentence, but, you know, the reality is that both because of his own qualities and because of, frankly, the eloquence of his counsel, this Court has given Mr. Materasso opportunity after opportunity. And he's blown it. And at some point the Court has to say that while Mr. Materasso's future is the most important thing in the Court's determination of sentence, it's not the only thing; and that you just can't continue to violate the orders of the Court and expect that the Court won't seek to vindicate its orders in a way that will establish that vindication not just for the defendant, but for the greater good of the probation office; and the need to show every defendant that you violate the orders of the Court and you violate the orders and the help of the probation office, and you suffer the consequences.

So that's the problem you face. I continue to be sympathetic to Mr. Materasso as an individual, but I can no longer let that be overwhelmed over all other factors.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, obviously I fully respect the Court's views. And there is no doubt that your Honor has given Mr. Materasso opportunity after opportunity to deal with his substance abuse problems. There's no doubt that he has not complied with the Court's orders on multiple occasions.

However, we respectfully submit that the nine months sought by government and probation is much greater than necessary to accomplish the purposes of sentencing.

THE COURT: That's a different issue. But time served won't do it.

MS. PEERCE: If I can just continue, Judge.

THE COURT: Absolutely. And I should stress that I'm making these comments simply to reflect where my head is at at the moment. You may --

MS. PEERCE: I'm going to try, Judge. You know I don't give up.

Your Honor, we have no doubt -- and we thank the Court for leniency that the Court has shown Mr. Materasso on multiple occasions. And Mr. Materasso does not mean to be flouting the orders of the Court. I just want to be really clear there. He has, though, and there's no question about that.

We urge that the sentence your Honor imposes be imposed in the context of Mr. Materasso's really difficult prolonged battle with drug addiction. He fully accepts responsibility for what brings him before your Honor here today. We note the nature of this present violation is a marked contrast with his previous violations, which did involve violence, drug use, not reporting to probation as directed, etc.

They're not criminal acts, the most recent violation.

The present violation, your Honor, as we tried make clear in our submission, is indicative of his active engagement in trying to recover from what's almost a life-long addiction. It doesn't go back to birth, but as your Honor knows from his presentence report, which probation kindly provided to us, as counsel on the supervised release indicates that his drug use goes back many, many years. He has not yet developed his ability to control his impulses while he detoxifies. There's no question about it. His conduct reflects that.

His addiction is not an excuse, Judge. But we urge that it be taken into consideration in the context when your Honor imposes sentence. He has, as of today, been incarcerated for five weeks at the MCC. Not in camp. He's had adequate time, and I've spent quite a bit of time with Mr. Materasso discussing this.

He understands the ramifications of his conduct. He missed the birth of his second child. That child was born early. Who knows whether it was as a result of stress, but he missed that birth. We respectfully submit -- I heard what your Honor said, that time served is not going to happen, but I'm not going to give up. We respectfully submit --

THE COURT: And I should stress that I always keep an open mind until I've heard from counsel fully. So go ahead.

MS. PEERCE: We respectfully submit that further incarceration at this time is, most respectfully, not the

appropriate result. We respectfully submit that his current mental and medical health needs, which are really mental health needs, are bet met in a nonincarceratory setting.

We urge that your Honor sentence Mr. Materasso to time served, require that he continue outpatient treatment that requires him to report daily to probation, and he will do so. But we urge that he be permitted to return to his family and to continue his drug treatment on an outpatient basis.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Let me hear from the government.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, the government is largely prepared to rest on its submission.

THE COURT: Let me ask you two questions. The first is, do you know whether -- I'm not sure it's material, but just out of curiosity, whether the person with whom the defendant had this altercation that led to this violation is someone who's had other problems with other patients in the past?

That's the allegation in the defense submission.

MR. TEHRANI: Can you bear with me one moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, we have discharge paperwork that defense counsel has, the government has, but we are happy to pass up to your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me take a look.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, if I may, the discharge paperwork does specifically say that this person has been in a number of verbal altercations himself.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll take a look.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, it raises issues that were not before the Court. That's why I'm trying to see if there's a way of it not getting handed up, most respectfully.

THE COURT: No. I don't know of any rule of law that prohibits me from looking at it.

Do you know of any?

MS. PEERCE: I don't, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then let's take a look. (Pause)

Well, again, I'm not sure how material any of this is, but just so the record is clear, under narrative summary, summary course of treatment, this report, which is the clinical discharge summary of Mr. Materasso from Arms Acres says:

Patient entered treatment and seemed willing to participate in program activities. Patient maintained an average level of motivation when he attended groups and lectures during his stay in treatment. Patient was addressed for smoking in his room and having his cell phone hidden. Patient was also was addressed twice for verbal altercations with fellow peer. The final verbal altercation happened between patient and a fellow peer who had been in a number of verbal altercations himself.

Due to the nature of this verbal altercation, patient was administratively discharged for threatening to beat up and rape a fellow patient. Patient did complete all assignments on time and participated in several recreational activities and twelve-step functions.

So I'll give that back to the government.

Let me ask the defense counsel, does the defendant admit or deny the allegation that he threatened to rape the other patient?

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, I don't want to get to a hearing. I'm trying to avoid that.

It is my understanding that that is not what Mr. Materasso recalls saying to the patient, but he does recall saying something which was threatening.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. PEERCE: So that --

THE COURT: I'm content to leave it at that.

Back to the government. The other question I have for the government is there are two factors that seem to me to be particularly important with respect to this sentence, although I, of course, have considered all of the relevant factors under the law. One is simply punishment for someone who, despite all the opportunities given him by the Court in the past, still committed a violation of supervised release.

The second is the broader point that I referred to

previously. There comes a point where if a Court does not visit repeated violations of supervised release with meaningful punishment, the Court is, in effect, sending the message that these are not real orders; they are paper orders; the probation office can't rely on the Court to enforce the terms of supervised release. And that perception has to be eliminated.

So I think it comes down to, in practical terms, the least sentence that I could possibly give that would still fulfill all the functions of sentencing would be six months. I don't think there's an argument here by anyone for more than nine months.

In between those two, I think what weighs with the Court that I'm uncertain about is the degree to which Mr. Materasso has tried to overcome his addiction and his problems. Defense counsel basically is suggesting that notwithstanding that a substantial period of addiction — lifetime is clearly an exaggeration, but I believe it's from the age of 22. So it's lasted for quite a long time; in any event, a serious addiction — he is making efforts to overcome that, which is, of course, an important goal. And that would warrant, perhaps, some mitigation of the sentence that might otherwise be imposed.

So I wondered whether -- I'm really asking, I think, the probation officer what her view is of his efforts in that regard. Is it substantial? Is it sincere? Is it window

dressing or what?

OFFICER: I believe that his efforts have been sincere when it comes to addressing his drug addiction. The problem I have with this is that the discharge from the program is not about, say, suffering a relapse. You would expect a drug addict to suffer a relapse. But his discharge from the program was about just breaking program rules; cell phone, cigarettes, the verbal altercation. That's the problem I have with saying that he has put every effort into addressing his drug addiction. It's a separate issue.

THE COURT: It doesn't sound like, in your view, someone who is really saying, if I really love my family, the most important thing I can do is really conquer this; but it sounds more like he's saying, well, it's important but --

OFFICER: I'm still going to do what I want to do with the cell phones and the cigarettes and verbal altercation. I would have an easier — if he had suffered a relapse or used drugs, that would be easier to say, okay, you suffer from substance abuse problems. But it's the other part of it that I just have an issue with.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from defense counsel.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, I actually walked over here because I couldn't hear, so I was trying to get in better hearing.

But I do want to say that the other issues were not -I just want to be clear, were not part of what the articulated
reason by Arms Acres as to why Mr. Materasso was discharged.
I, again, don't want to have a hearing here, but --

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. The tobacco part doesn't bother me so much because everyone knows that that's an addictive drug, too.

The cell phone does bother me. Is that not -- is he denying that?

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, may I just have one moment.

THE COURT: Yes. (Pause)

MS. PEERCE: Mr. Materasso does not deny that he used his cell phone, that one of his roommates had in his room. He does not deny that, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the point the probation officer is making, which seems to have some force, is that when all is said and done, he has not taken to heart the need to be completely attentive to the rules here, if he's going to solve his problem.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, as we cited in our submission a couple of studies which talk about that addiction, and recovery from addiction is not linear, as we would all hope it is; and that people who do suffer from addiction suffer from continued cognitive impairment, increased emotional dissonance, inherent impulsivity, behavioral problems increase and become

the focus of attention.

So with all respect to probation, which I absolutely thank and commend for their efforts with Mr. Materasso, I don't think you can separate even the cell phone from Mr. Materasso's addiction. I'm just --

THE COURT: I don't know -- I will take a look because I'm very interested in this area and Ms. Johnson's Law Review article. But what is her basis for saying that -- and always the problem with generalizations is that to what extent, if any, does it necessarily apply to this defendant? The increased emotional dissonance, among other things, I don't know what the heck that means. But it would presumably not cause him to use his cell phone.

Continued cognitive impairment, Mr. Materasso's always struck me as an intelligent fellow. Maybe he would be a genius without this drug addiction, but I don't think he suffers from particular cognitive impairment.

Impulsivity, I think, is relevant to the altercation. I don't know it's relevant to the cell phone.

But the bigger problem is, assuming for the sake of argument that these are scientifically established generalizations, we don't know whether those generalizations apply and to what extent they apply in this case.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, the only point I was trying to make is that I don't know whether there's a bright line that

you can separate between what might be as a consequence of the addiction and what might be just intentionally disregarding the Court's orders. I think that there is some blurry blur there. And I just think in the overall context, I've heard your Honor say that six months is the lowest you could go. I would respectfully urge that six months is more than needed, but as your Honor knows, I don't give up. And so I just -- I'm not sure what --

THE COURT: I'm sure that the loser of the Superbowl will still try hard in the last minutes of the fourth quarter, but that doesn't make it necessarily successful.

MS. PEERCE: I understand, your Honor. But I hope I'm not like the loser of this most recent Superbowl, because I think it was pretty much a blowout. And I'm hoping this is not a blowout.

I continue to urge that. I understand your Honor's statements about essentially deterrence and making sure that people understand that court orders mean court orders, but I don't respectfully think that six months is required to do that. I'm not sure what help it gives to Mr. Materasso in dealing with his addiction issues. And I just think that these five weeks in the MCC have been pretty harsh.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Let me hear from the defendant, if he wishes to be heard.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I chose to read.

THE COURT: That's fine.

THE DEFENDANT: I have reviewed the sentence submission and the letters submitted on my behalf, as well as the government's response. I know that your Honor has given me multiple opportunities to prove that I am worthy of the leniency your Honor has exercised in the past. I have squandered those opportunities and have no one but myself to blame.

I appreciate and understand that your Honor allowed and required me to participate and complete a 20-day inpatient program at Arms Acres. In addition to your Honor's directions that I participate, I knew that it was in my and my family's best interest for me to complete the program. Instead, I was caught up in a verbal altercation in violation of the program's rules and was unfavorably discharged from the program in violation of your Honor's orders.

I know I have said it before, but being discharged from the program and being in jail these past five weeks has forced me to reflect seriously on my conduct and its consequences. I have missed the birth of my second daughter and caused much unneeded pain and suffering to my wife, Erma, and my daughter, Gia.

I sincerely apologize for my extensive time and resources that your Honor has -- everyone in this courtroom

spent on the case. I am grateful to my family for the support that they have provided me and continue to provide when I come from my addiction. I am committed to my sobriety and recovery.

And I humbly beg your Honor to allow me to return home and seek counseling with my wife and routine substance abuse treatment. Your Honor, I'd like to say a few more things.

First, your Honor, no one grows up as a child saying, "when I get older, I want to become an addict." A drug addict is exactly what I am. I offer this as no excuse to this Court for me violating or not following the rules and regulations of my probation officer, Ms. Carroll.

Your Honor, addiction runs in my family. My brother is an addict. I've seen him struggle for years with addiction. He gave 100 percent to his recovery and now is clean for six years. I want nothing more than that. You said something to me back in 2010 after I addressed my family and apologized. You said if I truly cared about my family, I would not continuously put them through the pain and hardship that I do. That stuck with me for two years I was in prison and now. And I promised myself when I got out, that it would change, and that's exactly what I did.

Your Honor, today I stand before you alive as a promise to my two little girls, my wife, mother and father. I now face a similar question: How I can be so ignorant to believe that my drug addiction wasn't a serious problem that

needed day-to-day attention and that these court orders I put second? Your Honor, I do apologize to this Court for taking up valuable time; to the probation department, to Ms. Carroll. I have made a lot of mistakes in my life, your Honor. And I won't even stand here and ask you for another chance, because I know I have been given numerous chances in the past.

But I will say no matter what sentence you do impose on me today, I will follow those orders to a tee. I heard you loud and clear last court date that these court orders are binding. I will do everything to finish this supervision and whatever court orders are given to me.

Thank you, your Honor, for allowing me the chance to speak.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, as always when I hear from Mr. Materasso, as well as from his counsel, I am struck by the good side of this human being. If I lacked any other evidence of that, and I don't, I would know it from the strength of the attachment to him of his family. And the letters I've received from both Erma Materasso and Donna Materasso are, as always, both eloquent and heartbreaking at the same time. And there's no doubt that, as Mr. Materasso and I have discussed in the past, that they are victims number one of his problems.

But I come back to the points that I have already outlined. Mr. Materasso, this will always be the first concern

of the Court: Every judge must put themselves as best they can in the place of the defendant and grapple with the vicissitudes that human beings face. And this is not a case of someone who set out to be a crook in the classic sense, although it is ultimate -- excuse me. His original conviction, of course, was a serious crime. But that cannot be the only thing.

If the Court doesn't reinforce the orders and perceptions of the probation office, it fails miserably in its duty. It sends the message that the people who are most trying to help defendants will receive no meaningful support of the kind that counts and will be at the whim and caprice of a defendant's choices, mistakes. And I fully appreciate defense counsel's point that these are mistakes not made by someone who is operating with the total control that an everyday citizen will enjoy. But there's nothing that Mr. Materasso — that suggests that he was free of control, that he was operating under some kind of compulsivity so overwhelming that he was not making voluntary choices.

Well, putting all this together, I think some moderation in the nine months requested by the government and probation office is called for, but nothing like what the defense suggests.

So the sentence of the Court is that the defendant is sentenced to six months in prison, which, of course, includes five weeks he's already served, to be followed by one year of

supervised release on all of the same conditions previously imposed, with a further suggestion of a mental health treatment, if the probation office deems it appropriate.

Before I advise the defendant of his right to appeal, is there anything else counsel wishes to raise with the Court?

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, I believe in the last sentence there was a condition that the defendant participate -- specific condition that the defendant participate in a 28-day inpatient drug treatment program. Is that condition also being --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TEHRANI: -- reimposed for --

THE COURT: Yes. Assuming that the probation office agrees that that would be helpful thing. It sounds like it, to me, would be a helpful thing. But let me find out what the probation office -- no --

OFFICER: I don't think following an incarceration sentence that he be mandated right into --

THE COURT: All right. So we'll just leave it without that, then.

MS. PEERCE: Your Honor, if I may request that your Honor recommend that Mr. Materasso serve his sentence at the MCC, to at least enable --

THE COURT: Yes. I will certainly recommend that. As you know, I can't order that. But I'll be happy to recommend

1 | it.

MS. PEERCE: Absolutely. And if your Honor needs the basis, he does have a wife and two young children. And it enables them to see him more frequently than if he is taken hours out of town.

THE COURT: Yes. That makes perfect sense.

MS. PEERCE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Materasso, you have a right to appeal this sentence. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And if you can't afford counsel for the appeal, the Court will appoint one for you free of charge. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Thanks.

(Adjourned)